

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **January 24, 2005** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-26, and 28-30. Claims 1-6, 8-16, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as lacking antecedent basis for claim limitations. Claims 1-2, 4, 8-10, 11-12, 14, 18-20, 21-22, 24, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosche et al (USPN 6,718,542, hereinafter “Kosche”) in view of Chase et al (USPN 6,149,318, hereinafter “Chase”). Claims 3, 13, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosche, in view of Chase, further in view of Crank et al (USPN 5,583,988, hereinafter “Crank”). Claims 5-6, 15-16, and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosche, in view of Chase, further in view of SUN Microsystem, Inc. (*C User’s Guide Supplement for the Forte Developer 6 update 1* (Sun Workshop 6 update 1), Part No. 806-6145-10, October 2000, Revision A, XP-002242198, hereinafter “SUN”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1-6, 8-16, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as lacking antecedent basis for claim limitations.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to correct the antecedent basis for the claim limitations. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kosche in view of Chase.

Applicant respectfully points out that subject matter of application serial number 09/549,806, now USPN 6,718,542 B1 (Kosche) and the instant application were, at the time of invention, owned by the same person or subject to assignment to the same person. Kosche, therefore, is not a valid reference against

the instant application per 35 U.S.C. §103(c)(1) and the rejections based upon Kosche should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits the attached terminal disclaimer to obviate any double patenting rejection.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-6 and 8-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-16 and 18-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-26 and 28-30, which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: March 25, 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665